



8-28-1913

Grabbing The Hetch Hetchy.

John Muir

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/jmb>

Recommended Citation

Muir, John, "Grabbing The Hetch Hetchy." (1913). *John Muir: A Reading Bibliography by Kimes*. 372.
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/jmb/372>

This News Article is brought to you for free and open access by the John Muir Papers at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in John Muir: A Reading Bibliography by Kimes by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

GRABBING THE HETCH HETCHY.

With very few exceptions, the newspapers of the country are protesting against the proposed gift of the Hetch Hetchy valley to the city of San Francisco for a water supply. Of course the San Francisco newspapers champion the project, and so do a few others. But the overwhelming sentiment, taking the country through, is manifestly in opposition.

This valley is now a national park, reserved for that purpose on account of its marvellous scenic beauty. It is the property of the nation, not of the city of San Francisco, nor the state of California. The engineers say, and no doubt they are correct, that it can be made the source of an enormous supply of water, and San Francisco covets that water. And it proposes to get that water without paying for it, if possible. Robert Underwood Johnson, who is doing vallant work in opposition to this grab, cites in a review of the matter this incident:

"At the hearing before the public lands committee of the senate, Mr. Nelson of Minnesota in the chair, Mr. McCutcheon said to Mr. James D. Phelan, then and now the most conspicuous advocate of the scheme, substantially this:

" 'You know, Mr. Phelan, that you could go out over night anywhere along the Sierra and get an abundant supply of pure water for the city.' "

" 'Yes,' said Mr. Phelan, 'by paying for it.' "

"And Mr. Manson (another advocate) echoed, 'Yes, by paying for it.' "

Entirely apart from whether this plan is not a piece of vandalism, the cool effrontery of San Francisco is sufficient for unmitigated condemnation. And considering that the water is not needed so much for domestic supply as it is wanted for the promotion of manufacturing concerns, no good reason whatever exists why San Francisco should not buy its water.

man-fashion. In his letter, Mr. Johnson forcibly says:

"In other words, the American people are asked to subsidize the city's water supply to the extent of the money value of Hetch Hetchy and of five hundred square miles of phenomenal scenery. Put up at auction, what would this wonderland bring? 'What am I bid,' the auctioneer might say, 'for one superb valley, twenty miles of unique cascades, half a dozen snow peaks, beautiful upland meadow, noble forests, etc., now owned by a gentleman named Uncle Sam, suspected of not being able to administer his own property? Do I hear \$20,000,000 to start the bidding? Remember that these natural features are priceless.' "

A practical way of protesting is by writing in opposition to the scheme to the senators from this state, and the representative from this district. It might be well to include Senator George E. Chamberlain, chairman of the public lands committee.
